

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 QUINCETTA Y. CARGILL,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO. C22-0949-JCC

ORDER

14
15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's objections (Dkt. No. 22) to the Report
16 and Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable S. Kate Vaughan, United States Magistrate
17 Judge (Dkt. No. 21). Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby
18 OVERRULES Plaintiff's objections, ADOPTS the R&R, and DISMISSES Plaintiff's amended
19 complaint (Dkt. No. 13) with prejudice, for the reasons explained herein.

20 The facts and procedural history of this case are described in Judge Vaughan's R&R, (*see*
21 *generally*, Dkt. No. 21 at 1–6), and the Court will not repeat them here. Plaintiff claims that her
22 rights were violated by government officials in a federal criminal case in the Northern District of
23 Alabama. (*Id.* at 2.) Judge Vaughan found that Plaintiff's claims were "too vague and conclusory
24 to state a claim" and that her "amended complaint does not set forth facts supporting a causal
25 connection, beyond pure speculation, between their alleged failure to act and Plaintiff's alleged
26 injury, i.e., her criminal conviction." (*Id.* at 8–9). Plaintiff objected to the R&R, but failed to

1 identify any specific issues for review. (See generally Dkt. No. 22.)

2 The Court reviews *de novo* those portions of a R&R to which a party objects. 28 U.S.C.
3 § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Objections are required to enable the court to “focus
4 attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.”
5 *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). A party properly objects by timely filing “specific
6 written objections” to the magistrate judge’s R&R as required under Federal Rule of Civil
7 Procedure 72(b)(2). General objections, or summaries of arguments previously presented, have
8 the same effect as no objection at all, since the Court’s attention is not focused on any specific
9 issues for review. See *Simpson v. Lear Astronics Corp*, 77 F.3d 1170, 1175 (9th Cir. 1996); see
10 also *Djelassi v. ICE Field Office Director*, 434 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (W.D. Wash. 2020) (district
11 courts only review *de novo* “those portions of the report and recommendation to which specific
12 written objection is made”).

13 Plaintiff’s objections reiterate and summarize her vague and conclusory claims, and point
14 to no specific error by Judge Vaughan. (Compare Dkt. No. 22, with Dkt. No. 13). Thus, they
15 amount to no objection at all, since they do not focus the Court’s attention on any specific issues
16 for review, and they provide the Court without a basis to reject the R&R. See *Howard v. Sec'y of*
17 *Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

18 For the foregoing reasons, the Court OVERRULES Plaintiff’s objections, (Dkt. No. 22),
19 ADOPTS Judge Vaughan’s R&R, (Dkt. No. 21), and DISMISSES Plaintiff’s complaint (Dkt.
20 No. 13) with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim upon which
21 relief may be granted.¹

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26¹ The clerk is DIRECTED to strike all other pending motions for this case as moot.

1 DATED this 3rd day of March 2023.
2
3
4

John C. Coughenour

5 John C. Coughenour
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26